REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thoroughness with which the Examiner has examined the above-identified application. Reconsideration is requested in view of the amendments above and the remarks below.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner has stated that claims 6 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's review and allowance of these claims, and has endeavored to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections. Claims 6 and 21 have been rewritten to include all the limitations of the respective base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant submits that these claims are now in a condition for allowance.

Specification Objections

The Examiner has objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that claim 16 recites "a command html for a collapsed section" and "a command html for an expanded section." The Examiner has considered the command html as a twisty for the purposes of examination. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's designation. As noted in reference to Fig. 4, a sample document is shown in various states of expansion. "Collapsed and expanded triangular 'twisties' 50 indicate expanded or collapsed versions." Specification, ¶ 0033.

Applicant submits that the specification's reference to "collapsed and expanded triangular twisties" is sufficient antecedent bases for the command html for collapsing and expanding a section. Applicant notes that the Examiner's consideration is the proper consideration for examination purposes.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner has rejected claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner notes that it is unclear as to what N in the phrase "depth N expansion" is referring to since N is not defined in claim 6.

The present invention involves intelligent fetching of section-rich document data, which results in one fetch for the unexpanded document and one fetch per level, for a total of 1+N fetches. Specification, ¶ 0026. Thus, N represents a quantifiable maximum number of fetches or sections being expanded. "Any new sub-tier sections (sub-sections) are again revealed and parsed, and subsequent iterative fetching steps are performed until all level N sections are expanded." Specification, ¶ 0028. "N" has also been referred, interchangeably, to the number of depths. "Javascript conditionals are then applied to html deltas 48 and merged into depth N-1." Specification, ¶ 0030.

As noted above, N refers to the maximum levels, fetches, or depths of an expansion. Applicant concurs with the Examiner's suggestion to have "N" defined in the claims. Applicant has amended claim 6 accordingly. Applicant has also made claims 7, 10, 11, 12, and 15 depend directly from claim 6.

The Examiner has rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner notes that it is

unclear as to what the cited html query is. Applicant notes that the specific query is an expand section html query for a plurality of section expansions. See, Claim 8. Claim 9 designates a particular command for this application.

The Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner notes that claim 10 recites the limitation "by said comparison of said pre- and post- expanded section documents." The Examiner notes that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, since it is not referred to in claim 4. Applicant concurs and has amended claim 10 to remove the definite reference to pre and post-expanded documents, introducing them in claim 10 rather than in claim 4. This amendment also mitigates the Examiner's concerns with claims 15 and 16.

The Examiner has rejected claim 12 insomuch as claim 12 recites "said javascript conditionals" that are absent in claim 4. Applicant has amended claim 12 to properly refer to claim 6, where javascript conditionals are introduced. This amendment also mitigates the Examiner's concerns with claims 13 and 14.

The Examiner has rejected claim 15 insomuch as claim 15 recites "said javascript conditionals" that are absent in claim 10 or claim 4. Applicant has amended claim 15 to properly refer to claim 6, where javascript conditionals are introduced. This amendment also mitigates the Examiner's concern with claim 16.

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, because it is unclear as to what N in the phrase "depth N expansion" is referring to, since N

is not defined in dependent claim 21 or independent claim 19. Applicant has amended claim 21 in a similar fashion as claim 6 to remove this uncertainty.

The Examiner has objected to claim 7 because of added quotation marks and a grammatical error. Applicant has addressed each of these concerns.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Applicants intend to traverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to the cancelled claims in a forthcoming continuation application.

It is respectfully submitted that the application has now been brought into a condition where allowance of the entire case is proper. Reconsideration and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Curcio
Reg. No. 44,638

DeLIO & PETERSON, LLC
121 Whitney Avenue
New Haven, CT 06510-1241
(203) 787-0595

ibmf100415000amdA_11-13-07